



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

6

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,121

Applicant(s)

MATHUR ET AL.

Examiner

Yong Pak

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

Claims 1-3 are drawn to polynucleotides encoding proteins of unidentified function. The claimed polynucleotides are not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility. The specification fails to provide objective evidence of any activity for the encoded proteins or to show that these proteins even exist. Applicant only states that the encoded protein sequence shares structural similarity with animal kinases, especially serine/threonine protein kinases (page 2, lines 2-5). Since the specification sets forth no specific function for the encoded protein, the claimed polynucleotides encode a protein with no ascribe function. No specific, substantial and credible utility that is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material is indicated. Identifying a polynucleotide as encoding a kinase-like protein does not endow the polynucleotide with such a utility. Therefore, there is no specific, substantial, or credible utility that is well known, apparent, or implied by the relationship of the instant polynucleotide to the polynucleotide encoding a kinase.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention so that it would operate as intended without undue experimentation. In the state of the art, the function of a polynucleotide is unpredictable from its structure and the functionality of a polynucleotide must be known in order to use the polynucleotide. Therefore, the specification does not teach how to use polynucleotides with unknown function.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 is drawn to DNA molecules comprising 24 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1. A description of less than 1% of the whole structure of SEQ ID NO:1 amounts to an

insufficient description of the structure of the DNA molecule in this claim. Therefore, the claim is drawn to a genus of DNA encoding polypeptides with of unknown activity, or inactive variants with no limitation on structure. Applicants only describe DNA encoding SEQ ID NO:1 from humans. The specification also does not describe the function of all the polypeptide sequences encoded by the polynucleotides derived or modified from SEQ ID NO:1 and therefore, many functionally unrelated polynucleotides are encompassed within the scope of these claims. Therefore, the specification fails to describe any identifying characteristics or functionality other than comprising of 24 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1.

Given this lack of the description of the representative species encompassed by the genus of the claim, the specification fails to sufficiently describe the claimed invention in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize that applicants were in possession of the inventions of claim 1.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the mere recitation of the name "NHP" is insufficient to convey with clarity that which applicant sees as the invention.

In claim 2, the exact hybridization condition is unclear because the specification contains several stringent hybridization conditions (page 4, lines 17-29). Different nucleic acids hybridize to a DNA sequence under different conditions. Therefore, the scope of DNA molecules in claim 2 is unclear.

Also, in claim 2, the phrase "complement thereof" is unclear. Many different DNA molecules of any length can be complements of SEQ ID NO:1 or variants of SEQ ID NO:1. This rejection can be overcome by amending the claims as "the full complement thereof", for example.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hillier et al.

Hillier et al. teach a DNA molecule that is 99.7% identical to bases 1595-1976 of SEQ ID NO:1 (EST database - Accession # H16878). The DNA of Hillier et al. comprises of at least 24 contiguous nucleic acids of SEQ ID NO:1 and hybridizes to SEQ ID NO:1 under stringent conditions. Therefore, the DNA of Hillier et al. anticipates claims 1-2.


No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Pak whose telephone number is 703-308-9363. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Yong Pak
Patent Examiner



PONNATHAPURA ACHUTAMURTHY
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1000

June 28, 2001